

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claim 13 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

**Rejections Under 35 USC §102**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,823).

With regard to Claim 1, the Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not show each and every element of the invention as claimed in Claim 1. The Examiner asserts that the Nakagawa et al. reference discloses "a rotor assembly for an electric device comprising: a hub fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine; a rotor fixedly connected to the hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric device; and an elastomeric material (9) disposed between and interconnecting the hub (12) and the rotor (11) to provide torsional dampening."

The Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not disclose a hub that is fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine. Rather, the Nakagawa et al. reference specifically describes and claims a clutch having a "drive pulley which is for kinematic connection with a crankshaft of an internal combustion engine via a belt". The clutch of the Nakagawa et al. reference is adapted to transfer rotational motion from a belt, through the clutch when engaged, to a compressor. The hub (12) of the Nakagawa et al. reference is connectable to the shaft of a compressor to input rotation to the compressor, whereas the hub of the present invention is fixedly connectable to the crankshaft of an engine to receive rotation from the crankshaft.

Further, the Nakagawa et al. reference does not disclose "a rotor fixedly connected to the hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric device". The "rotor" (11) of the Nakagawa et al. reference is not a rotor at all, but an armature. The clutch of the Nakagawa et al. reference includes an electromagnetic coil (5) which is adapted to attract the armature (11) to engage the clutch, such that rotational motion can be transmitted therethrough.

The Applicants assert that the device of the Nakagawa et al. reference does not include "a hub fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine", or "a rotor fixedly connected to the hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric device". Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102(b) with regard to Claim 1.

With regard to Claim 5, the Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not show each and every element of the invention as claimed in Claim 5. The Examiner asserts that the Nakagawa et al. reference discloses "an electric device mountable to a vehicle drivetrain, wherein the drive train includes an engine, and crankshaft extending from within the engine on a front side, and a transmission, the electric device comprising: a hub (12) fixedly connectable to the crankshaft of the engine on the front side opposite the transmission; a stator (5) mountable to the engine independently of the crankshaft; a rotor (11) fixedly connected to the hub (12) and disposed within the stator (5) for operational engagement with the stator (5); and an elastomeric material (9) disposed between and interconnecting the hub (12) and the rotor (11) to provide torsional dampening."

As stated above, the Applicants assert that the device of the Nakagawa et al. reference does not include "a hub fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine", or "a rotor fixedly connected to the hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric device". The "rotor" (11) of the Nakagawa et al. reference is not a rotor at all, but an armature. The "stator" (5) of the Nakagawa et al. reference is not a stator at all, but an electric coil that is adapted to attract the armature (11) to engage the clutch. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102(b) with regard to Claim 5.

With regard to Claim 10, the Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not show each and every element of the invention as claimed in Claim 10. The Examiner asserts that the Nakagawa et al. reference discloses "a drivetrain for a motor vehicle comprising: an engine including a crankshaft fro transferring power therefrom; a transmission coupled to the engine; and electric device mounted to the engine opposite the transmission, the electric device including a hub (12) fixedly connected to the crankshaft, a stator (5) mounted to the engine independently of the crankshaft, a rotor (11) fixedly connected to the hub (12) and disposed within the stator (5) for operational engagement with the stator (5), and an elastomeric material (9) disposed between and interconnecting the hub (12) and the rotor (11) to provide torsional dampening."

With reference to the remarks made above, the Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not include "a hub fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine", or "a rotor fixedly connected to the hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric device". Further, the Applicants assert that the Nakagawa et al. reference does not disclose a vehicle drivetrain having such a device mounted thereon.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102(b) with regard to Claim 10.

With regard to Claims 3 and 8, in light of the remarks made above, the Applicants assert that Claims 3 and 8 are allowable as depending from allowable Claims 1 and 5 respectively, and therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §102(b) with regard to Claims 3 and 8.

**Rejections Under 35 USC §103**

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Nakagawa et al. in view of Keljik. In light of the remarks made above, the Applicants assert that Claims 2 and 4, Claims 6, 7, and 9, and Claims 11-14, are allowable as depending from allowable Claims 1, 5, and 10 respectively, and therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections under §103(a).

**SUMMARY**

The Applicants assert that pending Claims 1-14 as amended are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner grant early allowance of these claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 21 FEB 2003

By:



Jeffrey M. Cox

Registration No. 42,445  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
Telephone: (734) 302-6000

APPENDIX A

A rotor assembly for an electric device [comprising] includes a hub fixedly connectable to a crankshaft of an engine. [and a] A rotor is fixedly connected to the [said] hub for operational engagement with a stator of the electric machine. An elastomeric dampener is disposed between and interconnects the hub and the rotor to dampen torsional vibration from the crankshaft of the engine.

**APPENDIX B**

13. The drivetrain of claim [11] 10 wherein said hub includes an outer flange and said rotor is attached to said outer flange with threaded fasteners spaced radially about said hub.